

REMARKS

The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated July 30, 2003 have been carefully reviewed by the Applicants. The present Office Action lists Claims 1-25 as pending in the application. In an election made with traverse prior to the present Office Action, the Applicants elected Claims 1-25 out of Claims 1-42. However, the present Office Action does not acknowledge the traverse. It is the Applicants' understanding that when the initial requirement is traversed that it should be reconsidered pursuant to MPEP 821.01.

The initial requirement for restriction asserted that Claims 26-42 are drawn to an apparatus. The traverse was made on the grounds that Claims 26-42 are drawn to a process and not to an apparatus. The Applicants maintain the traverse and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the requirement for restriction.

Of the elected Claims 1-25, Claims 8-14 are allowed, Claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 19, and 21-25 are rejected, and Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 17, 18, and 20 are objected to. The Applicants thank the Examiner

for the allowance of Claims 8-14 and the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 17, 18, and 20.

Claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis (US 6173750 B1). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the grounds that Davis fails to anticipate every element of the invention as claimed in Claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25. Specifically, Davis fails to anticipate the element of a "die strip" or processing steps involving a "die strip."

As can be seen from the Abstract and Summary of Davis, the invention of Davis is directed to the handling of a "die." Davis further teaches that "die" generally refers to any type of component mounted to a flexible film. Thus, a "die" is an individual component and not a collection of components. This is reinforced at column 7, lines 60-64, where Davis describes die as being individually selectable as good or bad.

In contrast to Davis, the "die strip" of the present claimed invention is a collection of die (shown in Figure 4) that are processed together and not separated until the end of assembly as

described at page 24, line 21 to page 25, line 5. Davis teaches handling individual die or components, whereas the present claims include process steps directed to the handling and processing of a die strip that is not separated into individual die or components.

It should be noted that although Davis uses the term "die strip," it is only used as a sub-phrase in references to machine components such as "die strip head," "die strip arm," or "die strip assembly." The sub-phrase "die strip" in the context of Davis refers to the act of stripping a die, and not to a collection of die undergoing common processing. In the context of Davis, "die strip" in and of itself has no meaning.

In summary, Davis fails to anticipate the processing of a die strip. The Applicants assert that Claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit such action by the Examiner.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: October 24, 2003


Mehlin Dean Matthews
Registration Number: 46,127

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

408-938-9060